

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 41 continue to be in the case.

New claim 42 is submitted with the present amendment.

New claim 42 is based on the language in the specification, page 10, lines 12 to 14.

Claim 26 is being amended to render this claim in independent and fully allowable form.

The Office Action refers to Drawings.

4. The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the angle of the rolling curve arc, and the cylindrical forming tool must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. A proposed

drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Applicant is submitting an additional Figure 7 showing the angle of the rolling curve arc.

The Office Action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. Claims 17, 21, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

a. Claim 17, the structure of the cylindrical forming tool is not clear.

b. Claim 17 is being amended to obviate the rejection.

- c. Claim 21, it is unclear as to how "the driven gear wheel of one driven and driving gear set functions as the driving gear of another driven and driving gear wheel set." Specially, in the specifications, the applicant asserts the system is driven at the drive side 5.
- d. A gear wheel can have an interaction with a first gear wheel and being driven by the first gear wheel. At the same time the gear wheel can drive a second gear wheel. When the second gear wheel drives a third gear wheel, then we have the situation of claim 21. If the gear wheel is identified with "the driven gear wheel of one driven and driving gear set" of claim 21 and the second gear wheel is identified with the "another driven and driving gear wheel set" of claim 17, then the gear wheel and the second gear wheel represent the structure standing objected to in claim 21.
- e. Claim 37, the structure of the angle of the rolling curve arc is not clear.

- f. The angle ϕ_1 is the angle corresponding to the points of the rolling curve arc of the driving gear.

The Office Action refers to *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

8. Claims 1, 2, 9, 14-16, 20, 24, and 39-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Noye et al. (USPN 3,362,685).

Due to a misunderstanding on the side of the inventor as to how patentability of the claims can be demonstrated, no suitable discussion of the rejections expressed in the Office Action is attached. The undersigned attorney has emphasized to the inventor the importance of coherently responding to the Office Action promptly..

The Office Action refers to Allowable Subject Matter.

9. Claims 4, 6, 8, 13, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, and 36 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if

rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter. Applicant is submitting fully allowable claims in independent form.

Applicant observes that claim 29 containing allowable subject matter was classified in the Office Action of March 12, 2003 as a generic claim. It is believed that the allowability of claim 29 resolves the requirement of selecting a species and that all claims should now be given consideration as to patentability.

Applicant further observes that claim 26 was found to contain allowable subject matter. As claims 30, 34 and 35 are indirectly dependent on claim 26, these claims would also be allowable together with claim 26 and should be now considered as to patentability even though claims 30, 34 and 35 were assigned to a non-elected species.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.



All claims as presently submitted are deemed to be in form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Jorg Oser

By: *Horst M. Kasper*
Horst M. Kasper, his attorney,
13 Forest Drive, Warren, N.J. 07059
Tel.:(908)526-1717 Fax:(908)526-6977
Reg. No. 28,559; Docket No.: FLA204

rep/am/mm